DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 201 CG 012 021

AUTHOR Klein, Ronald J.; And Others
TITLE A Comparison of Perceptions of Selected Criminal Offenses as Rated by Adjudicated Youthful Offenders and Staff Personnel at an Ohio Youth Commission Facility.
PUB DATE Apr 77
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Conference of the Ohio Academy of Science (Columbus, Ohio, April 23, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; Behavior Problems; *Corrective Institutions; Criminology; *Delinquents; *Institutional Personnel; Perception; Recidivism; Research Projects; *Socially Deviant Behavior; *Staff Role; Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS Continuum of Criminal Offenses Instrument

ABSTRACT

This study examines the differences between staff personnel and adjudicated delinquents at an Ohio Youth Commission (OYC) facility on the Continuum of Criminal Offenses instrument, Juvenile Version (CCOJV). The CCOJV (Klein, 1975) measures perceptions of seriousness of criminal offenses and how raters would handle offenders. Subjects were high school students who were adjudicated delinquents committed to a facility, and staff members of the same facility. Results indicate significant differences between the staff at OYC and the high school students in the areas of total score, assault category, and sexual offenses class. Findings further indicate the existence of a continuum of seriousness of criminal offense categories ranging from the least serious (public order crimes) to the most serious (sexual offenses). This continuum is upheld for all groups investigated (staff, all students, first-time commitments, and second- and more-time commitments). The only exceptions to this are tested differences between status crime and public order offenses within the second- and more-time commitment group. A number of student treatment strategies are examined. Since staff rated criminal offense descriptions more seriously than students, it is suggested that they might be used effectively as role-models. (Author/JLL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED149201

A COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED CRIMINAL OFFENSES AS RATED BY ADJUDICATED YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS AND STAFF PERSONNEL AT AN OHIO YOUTH COMMISSION FACILITY

Presented at the OHIO ACADEMY OF SCIENCE, April 23, 1977, Columbus, Ohio.

Presenter:
Ronald J. Klein, Ph.D.
Instructor
The University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325
216-762-2928

David M. Weis, Ph.D.
Professor
The University of Akron
Akron, Ohio 44325
216-375-7777

Jon V. Thomas, M.S.
Teacher
Ohio Youth Commission

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David M. Weis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CG 012021

A COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF SELECTED CRIMINAL OFFENSES AS RATED BY ADJUDICATED YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS AND STAFF PERSONNEL AT A OHIO YOUTH COMMISSION (OYC) FACILITY

One of the most pressing social problems in society today is the ever increasing amount of juvenile delinquency (see Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics, annual publication). The ultimate aim of all youth authority personnel is the rehabilitation of the juvenile offender, but the means by which to accomplish this task is still quite unclear (see Gibbons review on the subject, 1975). What is clear at the present time is that youth authorities working at facilities such as the Ohio Youth Facility (OYC) are interested in examining more objective techniques to aid them in prescribing treatment programs for the adjudicated delinquents sent to them by the courts. At present, the adjudicated delinquents sent to OYC are assigned to programs through the use of I-level interviews (see Sullivan et al. original work in this area of I-Level Systems, 1957) and the writing of behavioral objectives. The use of the these ongoing screening and placement techniques by the staff personnel at OYC demonstrates their strong desire to obtain more systematic and objective information concerning each incoming youthful offender. The need for utilizing other objective and systematic methods to help the staff aid the adjudicated delinquents in the restorative processs is the primary reason that the investigators undertook the current study.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine in a more objective manner the differences, if any, that existed between staff personnel (hereinafter referred to as staff) and adjudicated delinquents (hereinafter referred to as students) at OYC on the Continnum of Criminal Offenses instrument (Juvenile Version) (CCOJV). The CCOJV was designed (Klein, 1975) to examine the differences between and within groups in terms of each groups' perceptions of selected criminal offense descriptions, and how the raters would then handle the offender who committed the specific crime.

The investigators believed that by objectifying this information, staff personnel might gain some understanding of how the students perceived selected criminal offenses as compared to themselves, a non-offender segment of the community. Subsequently, treatment strategies dealing with attitudinal and value systems with regard to the present legal prescriptions could be utilized to aid in the reeducation of the students. The ultimate aim being the establishment of more appropriate behavior and, subsequently, less illegal activities.

The Problem of the Study and the Research Hypotheses Used

The problem under investigation was to obtain some index as to how staff personnel and students at OYC perceived selected criminal offenses and how they would handle the youthful offenders who committed the illegal acts. Comparing the staff to the students provided a good indicator as to how a segment of the non-offender community perceived offenses when tested against the students.

The general and specific hypotheses that were examined are presented below:

General Hypothesis One (GH_1): (Non-Directional Hypothesis)

GH_1: There is a significant difference in terms of perceived seriousness of selected criminal offenses between the professional and line staff on each of the five classification categories and the total score (all five classifcation categories collapsed into one score) as measured by the Continuum of Criminal Offenses instrument (Juvenile Version) (CCOJV).

Specific Hypotheses One through Six (SH_{1-6}): (Non-Directional Hypotheses)

SH_1: There is a significant difference in terms of perceived seriousness of offenses between the Professional Staff and Line Staff on the Total Score area as measured by the CCOJV.

SH_2: There is a significant difference in terms of perceived seriousness of offenses between the Professional Staff and Line Staff on the Sexual Offenses as measured by the CCOJV.

SH_3: There is a significant difference in terms of perceived seriousness of offenses between the Professional Staff and Line Staff on the Assaultive Offenses as measured by the CCOJV.

SH_4: There is a significant difference in terms of perceived seriousness of offenses between the Professional Staff and Line Staff on the Non-Assaultive Offenses as measured by the CCOJV.

SH_5: There is a significant difference in terms of perceived seriousness of offenders between the Professional Staff and Line Staff on the Status Offense as measured by the CCOJV.

SH_6: There is a significant difference in terms of perceived seriousness of offenders between the Professional Staff and Line Staff on the Public Order Offenses as measured by the CCOJV.

cause the two groups were not found to be significantly different at the .02 probability level, the two separate groups (i.e., Professional and Line Staff) were collapsed into one group (hereinafter referred to as Staff) for further data analyses. In addition, the first general hypothesis was tested as a non-directional research hypothesis whereas the other hypotheses were examined as directional hypotheses.)

General Hypothesis Two (GH_2): (Directional Hypothesis)

GH_2: The Staff is significantly different in terms of perceived seriousness of selected criminal offenses than the Students on each of the five classification categories and the total score (all five classification categories collapsed into one score) as measured by the Continuum of Criminal Offenses instrument (Juvenile Version) (CCOJV).

Specific Research Hypotheses (SH_{7-12}): (Directional Hypotheses)

SH_1: The Staff is significantly different in terms of perceived seriousness of selected criminal offenses than the Students on the Total Score area as measured by the CCOJV.

SH_2: The Staff is significantly different in terms of perceived seriousness of selected criminal offenses than the Students on the Sexual Offenses as measured by the CCOJV.

SH_3: The Staff is significantly different in terms of perceived seriousness of selected criminal offenses than the Students on the Assaultive Offenses as measured by the CCOJV.

SH_4: The Staff is significantly different in terms of perceived seriousness of selected criminal offenses than the Students on the Non-Assaultive Offenses as measured by the CCOJV.

SH_5: The Staff is significantly different in terms of perceived seriousness of selected criminal offenses than the Students on the Status Offense as measured by the CCOJV.

SH_6: The Staff is significantly different in terms of perceived seriousness of selected criminal offenses than the Students on the Public Order Offenses as measured by the CCOJV.

In addition, three other general directional hypotheses were examined and their specific research hypotheses. Because it would be quite lengthy to state all these hypotheses in the sameformat as was presented on pages two and three, the investigators have decided to only state the general research hypotheses. They are as follows: (1) General Hypothesis Three (HG_3): The Staff is significantly different in terms of perceived seriousness of selected criminal offenses than the First Time Commitments at OYC on each of the five classification categories and the total score area as measured by the Continuum of Criminal Offenses instrument; (2) General Hypothesis Four (HG_4): The Staff is significantly different in terms of perceived seriousness of selected criminal offenses than the Second Time and More Commitments at OYC on each of the five classification categories and the total score area as measured by the Continuum of Criminal Offenses instrument; and (3) General Hypothesis Five (HG_5): The First Time Commitments are significantly different in terms of perceived seriousness of selected criminal offenses than the Second and More Commitments at OYC on each of the five classification categories and the total score area as measured by the Continuum of Criminal Offenses instrument.

Furthermore, the investigators examined the hypotheses that tested for significant differences within each group on the five classification categories in order to see if a criminal offense continuum, ranging from the sexual offenses to the status offense, would be supported. Because the Staff, Students, First Time Commitments, and Second and More Time Commitments were examined in a similar manner, only one set of general and specific research hypotheses will be stated.

General Hypothesis One (GH_1);

GH_1: There is a significant difference in terms of perceived seriousness of offenses between the five classification categories as rated by the Staff on the Continuum of Criminal Offenses instrument (Juvenile Version) (CCOJV).

Specific Research Hypotheses (SH_{1-4}):

SH_1: The Sexual Offenses are significantly more serious than the Assault, Non-Assault, Public Order, and Status Offenses as rated by the Staff on the CCOJV.

SH_2: The Assaultive Offenses are significantly more serious than the Non-Assault, Public Order, and Status Offenses as rated by the Staff on the CCOJV.

SH_3: The Non-Assaultive Offenses are significantly more serious than the Public Order and Status Offenses as rated by the Staff on the CCOJV.

SH_4: The Public Order Offenses are significantly more serious than the Status Offense as rated by the Staff on the CCOJV.

(By substituting in the terms Students, First Time Commitments, and Second Time and More Commitments for the word Staff in the above mentioned hypotheses, the reader could then examine the other research hypotheses that the investigators examined.)

The Continuum of Criminal Offenses Instrument (Juvenile Version) (CCOJV)

The Continuum of Criminal Offenses Instrument (Juvenile Version) (CCOJV) was developed to measure perceptions of seriousness of selected criminal offenses and how rater's would handle the offender(s) given the current criminal justice sentencing alternatives. The instrument was modified from the original Continuum of Criminal Offenses instrument (Adult Version) (CCOAV) which was developed by Klein (1975), who in tern modified Sellin and Wolfgang's (1964) Juvenile Delinquency Index. Those modifications that took place from the CCOAV were in the area of construction of new criminal offense descriptions believed to be more appropriate with the adjudicated delinquents and staff personnel at OYC. After close examination of the records available at an OYC facility, a number of offense descriptions were constructed for the instrument. Many of the original items from the CCOAV were retained in the juvenile version.

Statement of Procedures

The CCOJV was administered to high school students who were adjudicated delinquents and commited to an Ohio Youth facility for their illegal behavior. The students were administered the instrument within one week, and were tested in groups of twenty subjects per group. The Staff subjects that took part in the study were tested individually.

The research design that was employed was ex post facto in nature and was guided by past and present theoretical and empirical data and by specific research

hypotheses. Thus, the research hypotheses were derived by both logical and empirical data findings.

Finally, the instrument that was employed in the study was the CCOJV which was modified from the original CCOAV in order to test a group of adjudicated offenders and staff personnel at an OYC facility. (For more information concerning the CCOAV, examine the research findings obtained by Klein, Weis, & Newman, 1976.)

Statistical Methods

All data was analyzed through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) which is a packaged program commonly employed by social researchers in investigatory studies. Two different t-tests were used in analyzing these data. First, an independent t-test was used to test for significant differences between the various groups under investigation (i.e., professional staff vs line staff, staff vs students, staff vs first time commitments, staff vs second and more time commitments, and first time commitments vs second and more time commitments); and, secondly, a dependent t-test was used to examine significant differences within each group (i.e., staff, students, first time commitments, and second and more time commitments).

Results of the Continuum of Criminal Offenses Instrument (Juvenile Version) (Between Group Differences on the Classification Categories)

The research data concerning the CCOJV suggested that the one-tailed research hypotheses which tested for significant differences between groups (i.e., staff vs students, staff vs first time commitments, staff vs second and more time commitments, and first time commitments vs second and more time commitments) on the five classification categories plus the total score area (i.e., total score area, sexual crimes, assault offenses, non-assault crimes, status offense, and public order crimes) produced interesting results. First, the investigators tested to see if there were any significant differences between the professional staff and the line staff at OYC (non-directional research hypotheses were used). Because there were no statistically significant differences between the two groups at the .02 probability level (see Table 1), the investigators collapsed the two groups

Table 1

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE T-TESTS, PROBABILITY LEVELS, SIGNIFICANCES, OVERALL ITEM MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF (N = 17) AT OYC TESTED AGAINST THE LINE STAFF (N = 18) AT OYC ON THE CONTINUUM OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES INSTRUMENT (JUVENILE VERSION)

Variable Name (# of Items)	T-test	Probability Level	Prof.[a] Mean & (SD) N = 17	Staff[b] Mean & (SD) N = 18	Sign.
Total[c] Score (65)	-0.17	.433	7.6461 (1.059)	7.7008 (.830)	NS
Assault[d] (33)	0.09	.464	8.8645 (1.074)	8.8316 (1.052)	NS
Non-Assault[e] (26)	-0.16	.438	6.4050 (1.319)	6.4658 (.971)	NS
Pubord[f] (2)	-2.06	.023	2.3235 (1.541)	3.3889 (1.520)	NS
Status[g] (1)	-1.64	.055	3.8824 (2.421)	5.1667 (2.203)	NS
Sex[h] (3)	0.28	.389	9.8039 (1.334)	9.6852 (1.146)	NS

Note. An independent T-test was used to analyze the data dna an assigned alpha level of .05 for a one-tailed test was considered statistically significant. However, after the corrections for multiple corrections was employed (Newman & Frye, 1974), a .02 probability level had to be obtained before the research hypotheses were considered statistically significant.

[a] Prof. is an abbreviation for the Professional Staff at Ohio Youth Commission (OYC) (N = 17).

[b] Line is an abbreviation for the Line Staff at the Ohio Youth Commission (OYC) (N = 18).

[c] Total Score is the abbrviation for all the Offense Descriptions combined (i.e., Assaultive, Non-Assaultive, Public Order, Status, and Sexual Offenses) (65 Items).

[d] Assault is an abbreviation for the Assaultive Offense Descriptions (33 Items).

[e] Non-Assault is an abbreviation for the Non-Assault Offense Descriptions (26 Items).

[f] Pubord is an abbreviation for the Public Order Offense Descriptions (2 Items).

[g] Status is an abbreviation for the Status Offense Description (1 Item).

[h] Sex is an abbreviation for the Sexual Offense Descriptions (3 Items).

into one group (referred to as staff). Thus, future testing with the staff group was done by examining the whole staff who participated in the study (N=35) as they compared to the students as a whole, and the staff vs the students divided into two groups according to the number of previous commitments.

Secondly, the staff was tested against the student group as a whole (N = 83). Table 2 presents the data findings of the staff (N = 35) as they tested against the adjudicated delinquent students (N = 83) at OYC. The results indicate that the staff significantly rated the total score area (all 65 offense descriptions collapsed into one general score), the assault crimes, and the sexual offenses more seriously than did the student group. These same three areas were able to maintain their statistically significant differences even when the students were divided into two separate groups based on the number of prior commitments at OYC (see Tables 2, 3, and 4 for the research results). The investigators believe, based on the research findings, that the total score area, the assault category and the sexual offenses are good discriminators when testing for differences between the staff and the students at OYC.

Finally, the investigators tested to see if there were any significant differences between the first time commitments at OYC and the second and more time commitments at OYC. Table 5 presents the results of these testings. The data suggests that there were no significant differences between the two groups under investigation. Therefore, either the instrument was unable to discriminate between the first time commitments and the second and more time commitments at OYC or the differences which exist, if any, between the two groups are not based on their perceptions of selected criminal offense descriptions. Perhaps being a second time or more commitment at OYC does not markedly affect their perceptions of criminal offenses as compared with what their perceptions would have been at the time of their first commitment. This information appears to be somewhat contradictory to the past literature (e.g., Quay, 1964;Roebuck, 1967;Warren, 1964, 1973) which makes a case for second time and more commitments being different from there first time commitment brethren. It appears that a second time com-

Table 2

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE T-TEST, PROBABILITY LEVELS, SIGNIFICANCES, OVERALL ITEM MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE STAFF (N = 35) AT OYC TESTED AGAINST THE STUDENTS (N = 83) AT OYC ON THE CONTINUUM OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES INSTRUMENT (JEVENILE VERSION)

Variable Name (# of Items)	T-test	Probability Level	Staff[a] Mean & (SD) N = 35	Students[b] Mean & (SD) N = 83	Sign.
Total[c] Score (65)	4.30	.000	7.6743 (.935)	6.6829 (1.593)	S
Assault[d] (33)	6.71	.000	8.8476 (1.047)	7.1598 (1.734)	S
Non-Assault[e] (26)	0.82	.188	6.4363 (1.135)	6.2923 (1.724)	NS
Pubord[f] (2)	-0.07	.459	2.8714 (1.601)	3.1747 (2.186)	NS
Status[g] (1)	-0.04	.476	4.5429 (2.368)	4.6867 (2.862)	NS
Sex[h] (3)	3.63	.000	9.7428 (1.224)	8.6265 (2.172)	S

Note. An independent T-test was used to analyze the data dna an assigned alpha level of .05 for a one-tailed test was considered statistically significant. However, after the corrections for multiple corrections was employed (Newman & Frye, 1974), a .02 probability level had to be obtained before the research hypotheses were considered statistically significant.

[a] Staff is an abbreviation for the Professional and Line Staff collapsed into one group from the Ohio Youth Commission (OYC) (N = 35).

[b] Students is an abbreviation for the Adjudicated Delinquent Students from the High School at the Ohio Youth Commission (OYC) (N = 83)

[c] Total Score is the abbrviation for all the Offense Descriptions combined (i.e., Assaultive, Non-Assaultive, Public Order, Status, and Sexual Offenses) (65 Items).

[d] Assault is an abbreviation for the Assaultive Offense Descriptions (33 Items).

[e] Non-Assault is an abbreviation for the Non-Assault Offense Descriptions (26 Items).

[f] Pubord is an abbreviation for the Public Order Offense Descriptions (2 Items).

[g] Status is an abbreviation for the Status Offense Description (1 Item).

[h] Sex is an abbreviation for the Sexual Offense Descriptions (3 Items).

Table 3

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE T-TESTS, PROBABILITY LEVELS, SIGNIFICANCES, OVERALL ITEM MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE STAFF (N = 35) AT OYC TESTED AGAINST THE FIRST TIME COMMITMENTS (N = 63) AT OYC ON THE CONTINUUM OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES INSTRUMENT (JUVENILE VERSION)

Variable Name (# of Items)	T-test	Probability Level	Staff[a] Mean & (SD) N = 35	First[b] Mean & (SD) N = 63	Sign.
Total[c] Score (65)	3.13	.001	7.6743 (.935)	6.8835 (1.569)	S
Assault[d] (33)	5.41	.000	8.8476 (1.047)	7.3636 (1.661)	S
Non-Assault[e] (26)	0.07	.473	6.4363 (1.135)	6.4169 (1.694)	NS
Pubord[f] (2)	-0.45	.327	2.8714 (1.601)	3.0556 (2.106)	NS
Status[g] (1)	-0.62	.267	4.5429 (2.368)	4.9048 (2.944)	NS
Sex[h] (3)	2.60	.005	9.7428 (1.224)	8.8571 (2.147)	S

Note. An independent T-test was used to analyze the data dna an assigned alpha level of .05 for a one-tailed test was considered statistically significant. However, after the corrections for multiple corrections was employed (Newman & Frye, 1974), a .02 probability level had to be obtained before the research hypotheses were considered statistically significant.

[a] Staff is an abbreviation for the Professional and Line Staff collapsed into one group from the Ohio Youth Commission (OYC) (N = 35).

[b] First is an abbreviation for the First Time Commitments from the High School at the Ohio Youth Commission (OYC) (N = 63).

[c] Total Score is the abbrviation for all the Offense Descriptions combined (i.e., Assaultive, Non-Assaultive, Public Order, Status, and Sexual Offenses) (65 Items).

[d] Assault is an abbreviation for the Assaultive Offense Descriptions (33 Items).

[e] Non-Assault is an abbreviation for the Non-Assault Offense Descriptions (26 Items).

[f] Pubord is an abbreviation for the Public Order Offense Descriptions (2 Items).

[g] Status is an abbreviation for the Status Offense Description (1 Item).

[h] Sex is an abbreviation for the Sexual Offense Descriptions (3 Items).

Table 4

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE T-TESTS, PROBABILITY LEVELS, SIGNIFICANCES, OVERALL ITEM MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE STAFF (N = 35) AT OYC TESTED AGAINST THE SECOND AND MORE TIME COMMITMENTS (N = 20) AT OYC ON THE CONTINUUM OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES INSTRUMENT (JUVENILE VERSION)

Variable Name (# of Items)	T-test	Probability Level	Staff[a] Mean & (SD) N = 35	Second[b] Mean & (SD) N = 20	Sign.
Total[c] Score (65)	3.05	.000	7.6743 (.935)	6.2278 (1.625)	S
Assault[d] (33)	5.76	.000	8.8476 (1.047)	6.5182 (1.842)	S
Non-Assault[e] (26)	1.98	.023	6.4363 (1.135)	5.9000 (1.803)	NS
Pubord[f] (2)	-1.08	.178	2.8714 (1.601)	3.5500 (2.444)	NS
Status[g] (1)	0.95	.208	4.5429 (2.368)	4.0000 (2.534)	NS
Sex[h] (3)	3.29	.000	9.7428 (1.224)	7.9000 (2.144)	S

Note. An independent T-test was used to analyze the data dna an assigned alpha level of .05 for a one-tailed test was considered statistically significant. However, after the corrections for multiple corrections was employed (Newman & Frye, 1974), a .02 probability level had to be obtained before the research hypotheses were considered statistically significant.

[a] Staff is an abbreviation for the Professional and Line Staff collapsed into one group from the Ohio Youth Commission (OYC) (N = 35).

[b] Second is an abbreviation for the Second Time and More Commitments from the High School at the Ohio Youth Commission (OYC) (N = 20).

[c] Total Score is the abbrviation for all the Offense Descriptions combined (i.e., Assaultive, Non-Assaultive, Public Order, Status, and Sexual Offenses) (65 Items).

[d] Assault is an abbreviation for the Assaultive Offense Descriptions (33 Items).

[e] Non-Assault is an abbreviation for the Non-Assault Offense Descriptions (26 Items)

[f] Pubord is an abbreviation for the Public Order Offense Descriptions (2 Items).

[g] Status is an abbreviation for the Status Offense Description (1 Item).

[h] Sex is an abbreviation for the Sexual Offense Descriptions (3 Items).

Table 5

SUMMARY TABLE OF THE T-TEST, PROBABILITY LEVELS, SIGNIFICANCES, OVERALL ITEM MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE FIRST TIME COMMITMENTS (N = 63) AT OYC TESTED AGAINST THE SECOND TIME AND MORE COMMITMENTS (N = 20) AT OYC ON THE CONTINUUM OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES INSTRUMENT (JUVENILE VERSION)

Variable Name (# of Items)	T-test	Probability Level	First[a] Mean & (SD) N = 63	Second[b] Mean & (SD) N = 20	Sign.
Total[c] Score (65)	1.57	.061	6.8835 (1.569)	6.2278 (1.625)	NS
Assault[d] (33)	1.92	.029	7.3636 (1.661)	6.5182 (1.842)	NS
Non-Assault[e] (26)	1.12	.132	6.4169 (1.694)	5.9000 (1.803)	NS
Pubord[f] (2)	-0.83	.204	3.0556 (2.106)	3.5500 (2.444)	NS
Status[g] (1)	1.25	.110	4.9048 (2.944)	4.0000 (2.534)	NS
Sex[h] (3)	1.75	.038	8.8571 (2.147)	7.9000 (2.144)	NS

Note. An independent T-test was used to analyze the data dna an assigned alpha level of .05 for a one-tailed test was considered statistically significant. However, after the corrections for multiple corrections was employed (Newman & Frye, 1974), a .02 probability level had to be obtained before the research hypotheses were considered statistically significant.

[a] First is an abbreviation for the First Time Commitments from the High School at the Ohio Youth Commission (OYC) (N = 63).

[b] Second is an abbreviation for the Second and More Time Commitments from the High School at the Ohio Youth Commision (OYC) (N = 20).

[c] Total Score is the abbrviation for all the Offense Descriptions combined (i.e., Assaultive, Non-Assaultive, Public Order, Status, and Sexual Offenses) (65 Items).

[d] Assault is an abbreviation for the Assaultive Offense Descriptions (33 Items).

[e] Non-Assault is an abbreviation for the Non-Assault Offense Descriptions (26 Items).

[f] Pubord is an abbreviation for the Public Order Offense Descriptions (2 Items).

[g] Status is an abbreviation for the Status Offense Description (1 Item).

[h] Sex is an abbreviation for the Sexual Offense Descriptions (3 Items).

mitment or more does not increase the probability of a person developing a more negative and illegal attitude toward various legal prescriptions.

Results of the Continuum of Criminal Offenses Instrument (Juvenile Version) (Within Group Differences on the Classification Categories)

The research findings concerning the CCOJV indicated that all directional research hypotheses which tested each of the five classifcation categories (i.e., sexual offenses, assault crimes, non-assault descriptions, status offense, and public order crimes) against one another were found to produce statistical significance. The continuum of criminal offenses category scales found at the botton of this page visually depict where the overall item means for each classsification category fell in relationship to the other classes. Both the OYC staff (N = 35) and the OYC students (N = 83) are presented below.

CONTINUUM OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES
CATEGORY SCALE, JUVENILE
VERSION -- STAFF (N = 35)

LEAST SERIOUS CRIMINAL OFFENSES----------							MOST SERIOUS CRIMINAL OFFENSES		
1	2	3 (2.87) PO[a]	4	5 (4.54) ST[b]	6	7 (6.44) NA[c]	8	9 (8.85) AS[d]	10 (9.74) SX[e]	11

a PO is the abbreviation for the Public Order Criminal Offense Descriptions.
b ST is the abbreviation for the Status Criminal Offense Description.
c NA is the abbreviation for the Non-Assault Criminal Offense Descriptions.
d AS is the abbreviation for the Assault Criminal Offense Descriptions.
e SX is the abbreviation for the Sexual Criminal Offense Descriptions.

CONTINUUM OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES
CATEGORY SCALE, JUVENILE
VERSION -- STUDENTS (N = 83)

LEAST SERIOUS CRIMINAL OFFENSES----------							MOST SERIOUS CRIMINAL OFFENSES		
1	2	3 (3.17) PO[a]	4	5 (4.69) ST[b]	6 (6.29) NA[c]	7 (7.16) AS[d]	8	9 (8.63) SX[e]	10	11

Note. See the footnote below the Continuum of Criminal Offenses Category Scale, Juvenile Version (Staff) for a definition of the abbreviations used.

The data indicated that the staff at OYC scored the sexual offenses ($\bar{X}$ = 9.74) much more seriously than the assault offense descriptions ($\bar{X}$ = 8.85), the non-assault offenses ($\bar{X}$ = 6.44), the status crime ($\bar{X}$ = 4.54), and the public order offense descriptions ($\bar{X}$ = 2.87). The data results supported the directional hypotheses that the staff raters' perceived the most serious offense category as being the most serious (sexual), followed by the second most serious criminal offense area (assault), the third most serious crimes (non-assault), the fourth most serious offense category (status), and the least serious crimes (public order). Table 6 presents the summary table of the t-tests and probability levels for the five classification categories (i.e., sexual, assault, non-assault, status, and public order) as they compared to each other.

Table 6

Summary Table of the t-Tests and Probability Levels For the Five Classification Categories (Sexual, Assault, Non-Assault, Staus, Public Order) as they Compared to Each Other (N = 35)

Classification Category	t-Test Value[a]	Probability Level
Sexual Crimesvs Assault Crimes	-4.50	.000
Sexual Crimesvs Non-Assault Crimes	-13.40	.000
Sexual Crimesvs Status Crimes	-11.35	.000
Sexual Crimesvs Public Order Crimes	23.00	.000
Assault Crimes vs Non-Assault Crimes	13.80	.000
Assault Crimes vs Status Crimes	11.18	.000
Assault Crimes vs Public Order Crimes	19.96	.000
Non-Assault Crimes vs Status Crimes	6.03	.000
Non-Assault Crimes vs Public Order Crimes	15.90	.000
Status Crime vs Public Order Crimes	4.93	.000

Note. A .05 level of significance for a one-tailed test was considered statistically significant. However, after correcting for multiple comparisons, .01 probability level was considered statistically significant for a one-tailed test.

[a] The t-Test value calculated was done with a dependent t-test formula.

The research findings suggested that the students at OYC scored the sexual offenses ($\bar{X}$ = 8.63) significantly more seriously than the assult crimes ($\bar{X}$ = 7.16),the non-assult offense descriptions ($\bar{X}$ = 6.29), the status offense ($\bar{X}$ = 4.69) and the public order crimes ($\bar{X}$ = 3.17). The data results supported the directional hypotheses that the student raters' perceived the most serious offense category as being the most serious (sexual), followed by the second most serious criminal offense area (assault), and so on and so forth. Table 7 presents the summary table of the t-tests and probability levels for the five classification categories (i.e., sexual, assault, non-assault, status, and public order) as they compared to each other.

Table 7

Summary Table of the t-Tests and Probability Levels For the Five Classification Categories (Sexual, Assault, Status, Public Order) as the Compared to Each Other (N = 83)

Classification Category	t-Test Value[a]	Probability Level
Sexual Crimes vs Assault Crimes	-6.45	.000
Sexual Crimes vs Non-Assault Crimes	-9.73	.000
Sexual Crimes vs Status Crimes	-10.78	.000
Sexual Crimes vs Public Order Crimes	17.75	.000
Assault Crimes vs Non-Assault Crimes	8.74	.000
Assault Crimes vs Status Crimes	8.32	.000
Assault Crimes vs Public Order Crimes	16.55	.000
Non-Assault Crimes vs Status Crimes	6.08	.000
Non-Assault Crimes vs Public Order Crimes	15.42	.000
Status Crime vs Public Order Crimes	5.04	.000

Note. A .05 level of significance for a one-tailed test was considered statistically significant. However, after correcting for multiple comparisons, a .01 probability level was considered statistically significant for a one-tailed test.

[a]The t-test value calculated was done with a dependent t-test formula.

Initially, the data findings concerning the students at OYC were analyzed by placing all the tested adjudicated delinquents from the high school into one group. However, previous research studies (e.g., Quay, 1964;Roebuck, 1967;Warren, 1966, 1971) have indicated that first time offenders tend to be socially and psychologically different from first time offenders;thus, the placement of all the juveniles into one group was believed to be confounding the results of the study. Therefore, the investigators dividied the original high school sample (N = 83) into two groups: first time commitments at OYC (N = 63), and the second and more time commitments at OYC (N = 20).

The data indicated that the first time commitments' ratings on the CCOJV which tested each of the five classification categories against one another were found to yield statistically significant differences in all areas. The results suggested that the sexual offenses ($\bar{X}$ = 8.86) were scored much more seriously than the assault offense descriptions ($\bar{X}$ = 7.36), the non-assault offenses ($\bar{X}$ = 6.42), the status crime ($\bar{X}$ = 4.90) and the public order offense descriptions ($\bar{X}$ = 3.06). The data findings supported the directional hypotheses that the first time commitment raters' perceived the most serious offense category as being the most serious (sexual), followed by the second most serious crminal offense area (assault), and so on and so forth. In summary, all the one-tailed research hypotheses were found to be statistically significant at the .01 probability level.

Finally, the research findings demonstrated that the second time and more commitments' ratings on the CCOJV produced statistical significance on nine of the ten directional research hypotheses. The data results supported the hypotheses that the second time and more commitments' perceived the most serious offense category as being the most serious (sexual), followed by the second most serious criminal offense area (assault), and so on and so forth. The only research hypotheses that was not found to be statistically significant at the .01 probability level was the t-test between the status offense ($\bar{X}$ = 4.00;SD = 2.53) and the public order crimes ($\bar{X}$ = 3.55;SD = 2.44). Even though the one-tailed research hypothesis did not yield statistical significance when the status offense was tested against the public order

crimes, the mean scores were found to be in the hypothesized direction. In summary, all but one of the ten directional research hypotheses were found to be statistically significant at the .01 probability level.

Implications

Previous research has indicated that offenders' and non-offenders' perceptions of various selected criminal offenses might very possibly be do to the raters attitudes, values, and socialization system (e.g., Klein, Weis, Newman, 1976). The present research study supports the previous findings (Klein et al., 1976) that offenders (in this case adjudicated delinquents at OYC) and non-offenders (both the professional and line staff at OYC) significantly differ on their perceptions of selected criminal offense descriptions. Because of these findings, the investigators believe that the staff at OYC might be able to contribute to a significant attitude and value change in the perceptions of the students at OYC by doing the following: (1) consciously acting as role-models for the students to emulate; (2) providing discussion and interaction between the staff and students on various topics dealing with hypothetical criminal activities and their consequences; (3) using recreational activities (e.g., baseball, basketball, football, chess, etc.) as a means of instructing how rules and regulations offer guidelines within which persons must cooperatively operate in order to obtain the desired end-results; and, (4) how satisfying and rewarding pro-social behavior might be if individuals understood the necessary means whereby they might be able to obtain their desired goals and aspirations without violating the present legal prescriptions.

On the other hand, the data did not support the fact that first time commitments differ significantly from second time and more commitments at OYC with respect to their perceptions of criminal offense descriptions. These findings indicate that the staff would provide the best input to the students in terms of conveying attitudes and values with respect to the seriousness of criminal activities. Also, it does not appear as if the second and more time commitments are contaminating the attitudes and values of the first time commitments any more than the converse is true. In summary, the staff, who significantly rated the criminal offense areas more seriously,

appear to be the best role-models for both the first time commitments and second and more time commitments at OYC.

Recommendations for Further Research

Research is recommended that would use the CCOJV with other groups of adjudicated delinquent students, staff personnel, and "law-abiding" subjects from the community-at-large. Without this additional research it would be difficult and risky to generalize beyond the samples that were tested in this study.

It is further recommended that the same instrument be administered to all incoming juveniles at OYC and readministered as they exited from the institution. Also, if the instrument is sensative to the changes in attitudes and values that an individual would go through in a prescribed treatment program, then these differences should be reflected in their second test results (pre- & posttest gain score differences in the favored direction of the posttest). Ideally, a profile of the "successfully rehabilitated" juvenile offender would aid the staff personnel in determining the type and length of treatment required for the incoming offenders.

Finally, some other areas of possible future research would include the following:

1) Comparing the test results of incoming offenders with both "successfully rehabilitated" juveniles and non-delinquent adolescent youths on the CCOJV;

2) Comparing the pre-test and posttest scores on the CCOJV from those offenders who had gone through the institution and had not returned with both non-offender adolescents and incoming offenders; and,

3) Increasing the number of items in each classification category in order to get a more accurate sampling (reliability) from each of the five offense areas.

Summary

The paper began with a short introduction, statement of the purpose, problem, research hypotheses, and the procedures employed in the study. The results of the study were presented in two parts: (1) first, the research findings which examined significant differences between groups as measured by the CCOJV;and, (2) secondly,

the research results which examined significant differences within each group as measured by the CCOJV.

The significant research results pertaining to the between group directional research hypotheses demonstrated that the staff at OYC were significantly different from all the students tested from the high school in the areas of total score, assault category and the sexual offenses class. These significant differences held up when the staff was tested against the first time commitments and the second and more time commitments separately. In addition, the findings indicated that a continuum of seriousness of criminal offense categories existed which ranged from the least serious offense category (i.e., public order crimes) to the most serious offenses (i.e., sexual offenses). The continuum of seriousness of criminal offense categories was uphelf for all groups investigated (i.e., staff, all students, first time commitments, and second and more time commitments from OYC) which tested differences between each offense category and another within the different groups examined. The only exception to this was the tested differences between the status crime and the public order offenses within the second time and more commitment group.

The implications section examined a number of possible treatment strategies which might be used effectively with the students at OYC given the present realities of the youth correctional facility. Because the staff appeared to rate the criminal offense descriptions more seriously than the students, the investigators believe that they might be used effectively as role-models in different institutional activities (e.g., educational, recreational, etc.) to convey important pro-social attitudes and values toward existing legal prescriptions.

The paper concludes with suggested further research which might provide other researchers with areas that need to be focused on and corrected or improved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Criminal Justice Research Center. Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics. U.S. Department of Justice, annual publication.

Gibbons, D. Offender Typologies — two decades later. British Journal of Cimino-logy, 1975, 10 (2), 140-156.

Klein, R. J. Continuum of Criminal Offenses Instrument. (Unpublished manuscript, 1975) (See A Comparison of pretrial intervention offenders and non-offenders on selected psycho-social instruments. Doctoral dissertation, Akron University, 1976.)

Klein, R. J.; Weis, D. M. and Newman, I. A discriminative analysis of pretrial intervention offenders and non-offenders on selected psycho-social instruments. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, September, 1976.

Newman, I. and Frye, J. A response to 'A note on multiple comparisons' and comment on shrinkage. Multiple Linear Regression Viewpoints, 1972, 2 (3).

Quay, H. C. Personality dimensions in delinquent males as inferred from the factor analysis of behavior ratings. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1964, 33 - 37.

Roebuck, J. Criminal Typology. Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Thomas, 1967.

Sellin, T. and Wolfgang, M. E. The Measurement of Delinquency. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.

Sullivan, C.; Grant, M. Q. and Grant, J. D. The development of interpersonal maturity: Applications to delinquency. Psychiatry, 1957, 20, 373 - 385.

Warren, M. Q. Classification of offenders and an aid to efficient management and effective treatment. The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1971, 62 (2), 239-258.

Warren, M. Q. The community treatment project: Interpersonal maturity level classification: Juvenile, diagnosis and treatment of low, middle, and high maturity delinquents, 1966 Edition. (Available from Center for Training in Differential Treatment, 3614 Fifth Avenue, Sacramento, California 95817.)